DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 458 807 FL 026 957

AUTHOR Duke, Karen; Mabbott, Ann
TITLE An Alternative Model for Novice-Level Elementary ESL Education.
PUB DATE 2001-03-00
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (St. Louis, MO, March 1-4, 2001). In: "MinneTESOL/WITESOL Journal," Vol. 17, 2000, 11-30.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education Programs; Curriculum Development; Elementary Education; *English (Second Language); Instructional Design; Instructional Development; Instructional Innovation; Questionnaires; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning
IDENTIFIERS Saint Paul PUblic Schools MN

ABSTRACT

School professionals are often dissatisfied with the current model of English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) elementary education. The typical 30-45 minute pull-out session often frustrates ESL teachers because of the amount of time is inadequate. This causes frustration among the mainstream teachers because of the class time the ESL learners miss. Teachers involved in inclusion models sometimes feel their expertise is not being utilized, and believe that ESL students need some time away from their native, English-speaking peers to be comfortable practicing their own language skills. Teachers of self-contained ESL classes often believe that their students have too little academic and social interaction with the rest of the school. This paper presents an alternative model of delivery instruction for novice speakers of English, which piloted in one St. Paul, Minnesota elementary school in 1999, the TESOL Inclusion Program. After reviewing current models of instruction and their historical context, the paper explains why one school decided to try an alternative model that addressed the scheduling, social, and academic issues that are often problems for traditional models. The new model is presented in some detail and the resulting benefits to the students and teachers explained. Two appendices are also included: sample daily schedule for and ESL teacher and an educational essistant in the proposed new model (the TESOL inclusion program), and "The TESOL Inclusions Program" (TIP) Teacher Survey. (Contains 18 references.) (KFT)

Karen Duke
Ann Mabbott

Abstract
An Alternative Model for Novice-Level Elementary ESL Education

School professionals are often dissatisfied with current models of ESL elementary education. The typical 30-45 minute pull-out session often frustrates ESL teachers because the amount of time is inadequate and frustrates mainstream teachers because of the class time that ESL students miss. Teachers involved in inclusion models sometimes feel their expertise is not being utilized, and believe that ESL students need some time away from their native English-speaking peers to be comfortable practicing their language skills. Teachers of self-contained ESL classes often believe that their students have too little academic and social interaction with the rest of the school.

This paper will present an alternative model of delivery of instruction for novice speakers of English which was piloted in one St. Paul elementary school last year. After reviewing current models of instruction and their historical context, the writers explain why one school decided to try an alternative model that addressed the scheduling, social and academic issues that are often problems with traditional models. They present the process for developing the new model, how the model works, and the resulting benefits to the students and teachers.

This article was first published in *MinneWiTESOL Journal*, Volume 17, 2000.

Biography

Karen Duke is currently a teacher on special assignment with the St. Paul Public Schools. She was an ESL teacher at Frost Lake Elementary School for six years. Karen has been with the St. Paul Public Schools for seven years, teaching in St. Paul's self-contained ESL program and as a pull-out ESL teacher. Karen received her M.Ed. in Second Languages and Cultures Education from the University of Minnesota.

Ann Mabbott is director of the Center for Second LanguageTeaching and Learning at Hamline University. She started her education in the United States as an ESL student, and subsequently taught ESL and foreign language at a variety of levels. At Hamline University, she teaches ESL licensure courses in literacy skills and assessment, as well as courses for mainstream teachers who have ESL students in their classes. She has a Ph.D. in Second Languages and Cultures Education (Curriculum and Instruction) from the University of Minnesota.

An Alternative Model for Novice-Level Elementary ESL Education

Karen Duke, Frost Lake Magnet School
Ann Mabbott, Hamline University

School professionals are often dissatisfied with current models of ESL elementary education. The typical 30-45 minute pull-out session often frustrates ESL teachers because the amount of time is inadequate and frustrates mainstream teachers because of the class time that ESL students miss. Teachers involved in inclusion models sometimes feel their expertise is not being utilized, and believe that ESL students need some time away from their native English-speaking peers to be comfortable practicing their language skills. Teachers of self-contained ESL classes often believe that their students have too little academic and social interaction with the rest of the school.

This paper will present an alternative model of delivery of instruction for novice speakers of English which was piloted in one St. Paul elementary school last year. After reviewing current models of instruction and their historical context, the writers explain why one school decided to try an alternative model that addressed the scheduling, social and academic issues that are often problems with traditional models. They present the process for developing the new model, how the model works, and the resulting benefits to the students and teachers.

INTRODUCTION: KAREN'S STORY

The first students always reached the library before the end of the line had left the classroom. "They're like tumbleweeds," a colleague observed as my thirty students rolled and bounced loudly down the hall. "You're the only English speaker in the room?" people would exclaim in amazement when I described my job as a teacher in a self-contained elementary ESL program for students with low level English proficiency. "How do you do it?" teachers asked when I tried to explain my complicated system of six reading groups and two math groups for three grade levels with about one hour of assistance from a bilingual paraprofessional. From the students I heard language like this: Miss Du, he say, 'I not he friend' and he fight me but I not fight he and he take a pencil do like this to me and he say I cheat he line." Such approximate English was their primary way of communicating to me as I navigated them through the complicated routine of each day.

My self-contained ESL class had as many or more students than the mainstream classes in my school, more grade levels to serve, and less paraprofessional assistance. I had little communication or collaboration with the teachers in the building who were serving the same grade levels. There were many behavior issues in the class, and the retention rate of students was high. Upon exiting from the program, many students were placed in grades below their ages, because they were not academically able to enter the mainstream at grade level. I was particularly concerned about how the self-contained class isolated ESL students from their most important role models for language, culture and behavior: their native speaking peers. I believed that their isolation led to the pidgin-like exchange quoted above, and behavior that was not consistent with school norms.

These problems led my colleagues and me to consider designing a new model that would serve these students better than the self-contained classrooms had. In order to explain how the self-contained classroom model came into existence, we will begin this paper with a brief historical review of ESL education in Minnesota. We will then review models of instruction currently in use in the state to present some of the alternatives that different school districts have used. This article will then relate the process that we undertook to change the status quo, describe the model that we designed, and report on how students are faring under the new model.

BACKGROUND

The need for ESL students to be provided with appropriate instruction in English in the public elementary and secondary schools is fairly well-accepted among educators in Minnesota currently. The U.S. Supreme Court case Lau v. Nichols (1974) established the legal basis mandating both appropriate instruction and access to the curriculum for ESL students. Subsequently, the state established both ESL and bilingual licensure rules (1982), which had the effect of mandating that students with non-English language backgrounds be provided service from teachers who have professional credentials in the area of second language education. (See Edstam, 1998, for a discussion of professionalism and the elementary ESL teacher.) Although most educators now agree that schools should provide ESL students with special services, there is no universal agreement about how or by whom such services should be

delivered.

Program Models for Elementary ESL Students

Peregoy and Boyle (1997) describe in detail program models that are found across the United States. These include a variety of bilingual education programs which work well when a large concentration of one language group is found in a school. Both Minneapolis and St. Paul have some bilingual programs for Hmong, Hispanic and Somali students. However, most districts in Minnesota have not chosen to implement bilingual programs. In many cases they do not have the requisite concentration of one language group. In other cases administrators may not be convinced that the model is an effective option, even though research shows that some types of bilingual programs produce the most positive outcomes for students (Baker, 1997; Collier, 1992; Cummins, 1981). By far, the most popular option has been some kind of model where English is the primary language of instruction (Mabbott and Strohl, 1992), and first language support is available to varying degrees from bilingual paraprofessionals. In the St. Paul Public Schools, paraprofessionals are used primarily for translation of instructions and for home-school contact.

At the elementary level, the pull-out model (Mabbott and Strohl, 1992) is found most frequently in Minnesota. Typically, children are pulled out of their mainstream classroom for 30-50 minutes a day of ESL instruction. Advantages of this model include providing concentrated instruction according to student need in a setting where ESL students' needs are not subsumed by the demands of the larger class. The major disadvantages of the model are scheduling the class so that students do not miss important content in their mainstream setting, and the coordination of curriculum with the mainstream staff. Mabbott and Strohl (1992) discuss these issues in depth.

Pull-in, or inclusion, models of elementary ESL instruction are not as common as the pull-out model, but they are gaining popularity. Hale Elementary School in Minneapolis pioneered this model in the early 1990's. In the pull-in model, the ESL teacher goes into the mainstream class and team teaches with the mainstream teachers. When all teachers have planning time and are willing to work together, this

model can work well. It addresses the scheduling issue, which is the major problem with the pull-out model. The major disadvantage is that ESL students are not provided a safe environment away from native-speaking peers where they can practice language and ask questions that they may not ask in the mainstream class. (For a more in-depth discussion of the pull-in/inclusion model, see Mabbott and Strohl, 1992.)

Another model found in Minnesota at the elementary level is the English language development program (Peregoy and Boyle, 1997). In such programs, novice English proficiency students are served in self-contained classes with a teacher who has knowledge of second language development, and is also responsible for teaching the whole curriculum, including math, science and social studies. Newcomer classes, a type of language development program, are intended generally to be a short-term transition into the mainstream for recent arrivals (Rochester, MN has such a program). Other English language development programs may last a longer time and also serve students who were born in the United States but have few English skills upon entering the school system. The major advantage of these models is that they focus on ESL learner needs exclusively. The disadvantage has been that they isolate students in a separate classroom where they cannot benefit from role models provided by fluent English-speaking peers. This isolation prevents the interaction which is necessary to promote second language acquisition (Long, 1985).

St. Paul's Self-Contained ESL Model ("TESOL")

The TESOL[1] program, common in St. Paul until 1999, was an English language development program that served novice English proficiency level students. Schools which housed TESOL centers usually had two classrooms, one for primary grades (1-3) and one for intermediate grades (4-6). When the TESOL program was created, most of the students were newcomers to the U.S. In more recent years, however, students have also been placed in TESOL upon completion of kindergarten, with eligibility determined by the St. Paul Kindergarten TESOL Academic Test. In addition, low proficiency level students moving into St. Paul from other districts can be placed in TESOL based on language proficiency scores from the Woodcock-Muñoz Language

[1] St. Paul's self-contained ESL program, "TESOL", is not affiliated with the professional organization of the same name.

Survey (1993).

Until the development of the model described in this paper, TESOL classrooms were self-contained, often with many language groups and grade levels represented in each class. Students had some opportunities to be integrated with mainstream students, but the amount and type of integration varied from school to school, and the interaction was quite limited. Some years, due to high numbers of second language students coming into St. Paul, class sizes in TESOL were significantly larger than in mainstream classes, with limited help from bilingual educational assistants. Dissatisfaction with the lack of opportunity for students to interact with native English-speaking peers and large class sizes led teachers at Frost Lake School to consider changing the model.

Frost Lake Elementary School

Frost Lake School is located on the east side of St. Paul, in a predominately working-class neighborhood. Because Frost Lake is a magnet school, students come from all over the city. However, the majority of Frost Lake's approximately 600 students are from the east side. In the past decade, Frost Lake has seen a dramatic increase in the number of second language students. In 1993, about 47% of students spoke a first language other than English. In 1999, approximately 65% were non-native English speakers. Frost Lake's largest population group is Hmong, which comprises 61% of the student body. Other minority groups make up only 8% of the school, with European-American students comprising 31%. Forty-six percent of Frost Lake students receive some ESL services; the number receiving self-contained language development ("TESOL") services has varied from 3-8%. Sixty-four percent of Frost Lake students receive free or reduced lunch.

Instruction at Frost Lake is delivered in a traditional elementary setting, serving students in kindergarten through sixth grade. One teacher provides direct instruction in all subject areas to a class of 21-28 students.

DESIGNING A NEW MODEL

Because of the problems with the self-contained language development model

(isolation of students, lack of native-speaking role models, high rates of retention, behavior issues and large class sizes), concerned staff members at Frost Lake decided to design a better way to serve our novice English language students. Our team of mainstream classroom teachers, ESL teachers, curriculum specialists and the principal began meeting in the spring of 1997. We met throughout the 1997-98 school year with each other, district officials and university consultants from the area. We discussed best practices, philosophies, scheduling, placement issues, and budgets. Our principal, a very strong advocate for instituting a new model, convinced district administration that the initial extra costs would be money well spent. The new model would result in higher academic achievement by students, and would save the district money in the long run by meeting academic needs earlier.

Goals of the Program

In designing the new program, we had four goals. First, we sought to design a model in which students would have as many opportunities as possible for participation with mainstream peers in grade level curricula and classroom routines and activities. By integrating the students instead of isolating them, we believed we would see improvement over previous years in both their social development and their language acquisition.

Second, we hoped to include as much first-language support as possible. Instead of simply translating lessons after the fact, or having interpreters repeat everything in Hmong, we decided students would work initially with concepts and skills in their first language with a bilingual educational assistant when possible. After they had discussed a concept in Hmong, it would then be introduced in English by the ESL or mainstream teacher. (See Baker, 1997; Hakuta, 1986; and Krashen, 1993, for a discussion of the advantages of pre-teaching concepts in the native language.)

Our third goal in designing the program was to offer more individual attention to students. Since they had not been fully successful at acquiring English in kindergarten, where most received limited ESL services, we wanted to increase the amount of time spent in small-group, sheltered instruction, which would focus on the needs of the second language learner.

Finally, we sought to decrease the total amount of time spent in the language development ("TESOL") program, and to decrease the number of students who were placed, upon exiting, in grade levels below their ages. We knew they would still require many more years to achieve full academic proficiency in English (Collier, 1989), but we hoped that our inclusion model could accelerate the process. Ultimately, we hoped to exit most or all of our students, after one or two years in the program, into their correct grade level, rather than placing them in classes below their age level. After exiting, students would receive more limited ESL support until they no longer met the eligibility criteria.

After we had set our goals, we worked with district officials to set parameters to limit the numbers and types of students we would serve during a two-year pilot period. Instead of trying to serve all of the needs of the diverse ESL population, we wanted to start small. With some persuasion, the school district agreed to our requests. Since we wanted to use an educational assistant for extensive first language teaching, we needed a homogeneous language group. The majority of Frost Lake students are Hmong, so that group was the obvious choice. Similarly, since our old self-contained program had served mostly students coming out of kindergarten, rather than newcomers to the United States, we decided to tailor the new program to meet those students' needs. Therefore, we began with only first grade Hmong students who had attended kindergarten in St. Paul and qualified for self-contained language development services. During the second year, we would also serve second graders, but only those students who needed to remain a second year in the program. With our goals set, and parameters agreed upon, in the spring of 1998, our two-year pilot project, named the TESOL Inclusion Program (TIP), was approved to begin in September, 1998.

Students' Schedule

From the first day of school, TIP students were placed in mainstream first grades. Unlike students in the former model, who had been isolated within the school, they were always identified as members of those first grade classrooms for daily routine purposes (lunch, computer lab, and prep-time classes such as art and science). Staff

members did not differentiate TIP students in any way from their mainstream peers.

In addition to mainstream instruction, TIP students received services in and outside of their classrooms from their ESL teacher and bilingual educational assistant (E.A.). The ESL teacher worked with students at three times: reading, language and math. The educational assistant helped with reading and math lessons, and provided individual tutoring, home communications and other classroom support throughout the day. (See Appendix A for exact teacher and E.A. schedules.) The general student schedule was as follows:

8:00 - 8:20 Opening, Attendance, Calendar, etc.
8:20 - 9:10 Phy.Ed., Science+, Music or Art (rotating)
9:10 - 9:45 **Language Arts/ESL**
9:45 - 10:45 **Reading**
10:45 - 11:45 Language Arts/Writing, Spelling, Grammar
11:45 - 12:15 Lunch
12:15 - 12:30 Story Time
12:30 - 1:15 Math*
1:15 - 2:20 Social Studies, Art, Writing, or other activities

Times in bold taught by ESL teacher outside of the homeroom
* Indicates ESL teacher and E.A. team-teaching in homeroom with mainstream teacher
+ Indicates E.A. present (without ESL teacher), providing first-language support

Reading

Reading is taught at Frost Lake in small, instructional-level groups by all classroom and specialist teachers. Many of the groups are taught by ESL teachers. Therefore, for one hour each day, most students in first grade work with a teacher other than their homeroom teacher. The reading structure was convenient for the development of the new TIP model, as TIP students could simply go to their ESL teacher for reading instruction. Since all students were changing classrooms, and were working with different teachers, TIP students were not distinguished from other students. They could have the benefit of small-group, sheltered reading instruction without the stigma and scheduling concerns of pull-out.

Since we wanted TIP students to be working with grade-level curricula as much as

possible, the teacher used the first grade state standards as a guide for reading instruction and taught using the first grade reading series. The educational assistant provided much first language pre-teaching and support for stories and skills in the reading curriculum. Instruction was paced somewhat slower than other groups, as language was taught in conjunction with reading skills throughout every lesson. The teacher also supplemented the reading series with leveled, controlled readers at students' instructional levels.

Math

Unlike reading, math at Frost Lake is usually taught in a large, whole-class setting. Since math is often more accessible to second language students than reading, we wanted to keep TIP students in the classroom for math instruction. Therefore, the ESL teacher team-taught math with the classroom teacher and bilingual educational assistant. The bilingual educational assistant did pre-teaching in Hmong for the TIP students, and sometimes for the entire class. In planning and implementing math lessons, the classroom teacher remained the main driver of the math curriculum, using state standards and the district-adopted math textbook as guides. The ESL teacher provided continuous input on how to adapt lessons and activities to make them accessible for TIP students. Lead teaching roles were shared between the two teachers.

Pull-out Language Time

In addition to reading and math, the ESL teacher had one pull-out session with TIP students each day. For one half hour, students worked with the ESL teacher in what resembled a traditional pull-out ESL class. During this time, work focused on developing oral language skills through conversation, singing, role-playing and chanting. Another objective was to expand students' basic English vocabulary in areas such as school, family, foods, clothing, body, home, and community. Frequent writing activities were included to teach and reinforce reading and writing skills while supporting vocabulary development.

Bilingual Educational Assistant (E.A.)

As mentioned above, the bilingual educational assistant worked in conjunction with

the ESL teacher during reading group and math class sessions. We knew that research supports the use of the first language to enhance academic achievement (Auerbach, 1993; Collier, 1992; Cummins, 1981; Hakuta, 1986; Krashen, 1996; Lucas and Katz, 1994). Therefore, in our new program, we decided that the bilingual E.A.'s role in instruction should be expanded. The E.A. did extensive teaching in Hmong, usually pre-teaching skills and concepts that would be introduced later in English. In reading class, he also led discussions of stories we had read. With the use of Hmong, students received continual reinforcement of concepts in their first language. Traditionally, bilingual paraprofessional staff have been used as translators, which often leads to students ignoring English instruction and waiting for their first language. In TIP, the first language was used to enhance students' understanding of lessons.

In addition to teaching in Hmong within small-group and classroom instruction, the E.A. provided individual short-term tutoring for students as needed. When a student was struggling with a particular skill or concept, the E.A. would work with the student for 15-30 minutes daily for up to two weeks. The classroom or ESL teacher would assign tasks for the student to complete with the E.A.'s assistance.

Another important role of the educational assistant was home-school communication. The E.A. made weekly contact with TIP students' families about numerous issues relating to the health, behavior, and academic progress of their children. When correspondence was sent home to parents about field trips, testing, parent teacher conferences, or other issues, he explained the content to students and then called families to be sure they had received the information. When telephone contact was not adequate to meet student needs, he made home visits. In the homes, he explained school correspondence and modeled homework supervision for students who were not completing assignments. When parents could not come to school, the E.A. facilitated parent-teacher conferences in the home.

In addition to regular contact with families, the E.A. also led two informational meetings at school for parents. Families came to know and trust the E.A. and called often to ask questions about their children. The children sensed the home-school connection and responded well to the greater accountability it fostered.

Assessment and Reporting

In the past, in pull-out programs, the ESL teacher has had little or no direct accountability for reporting progress. The lack of opportunity to be involved in the reporting process sometimes leads to diminished professional status for the ESL teacher. In our model, since the ESL teacher and classroom teacher shared much of the teaching of TIP students, we wanted assessment and reporting to be shared as well. With TIP, we wanted to establish a new model for shared accountability and reporting which would work within the limited planning time available to all teachers.

We decided that both the ESL and classroom teachers would collect samples of student work for the portfolio. Then, each teacher would complete the report card for subjects in which she taught the TIP students. The ESL teacher reported for reading and language, and the classroom teacher reported for social studies. For math, which was taught collaboratively, the ESL teacher and classroom teacher completed the report together. The personal and social growth section of the report card was also completed jointly by the classroom and ESL teachers. The appropriate specialists reported for physical education, art, music and science.

To enable the two teachers to report together, a substitute was provided for the ESL teacher for one day, and for each classroom teacher for one hour on that day. The ESL teacher met with each teacher to complete the math reporting, compare notes in all areas, and finalize the entire report card. At parent-teacher conference time, each parent met with the classroom teacher, ESL teacher, and bilingual E.A. together. All three staff provided information about the child's progress to parents, with the E.A. serving as interpreter when necessary.

BENEFITS OF THE NEW PROGRAM

Over the course of the year, we noted several specific advantages of the new TIP program. First, TIP students were fully integrated into the mainstream. Several specialist teachers remarked that, even several months into the year, they could not distinguish between TIP and mainstream students. Instead of being isolated in a class

with fewer resources and less access to authentic English, TIP students participated fully in assemblies, field trips, fund raisers, and all aspects of school life in a way they had not before. Instead of being perceived as a strange, special class down the hall, TIP students had the same opportunities to be known, liked and respected as everyone else. In addition, teachers were able to work collaboratively for the first time, which benefited both TIP and non-TIP students. Working in the new model forced the ESL teacher to become familiar with the mainstream curriculum and the standards which all students are expected to meet. The collaboration also helped mainstream teachers learn how to serve their ESL students more effectively.

Language and Social Development

Because of their exposure to mainstream peer role models, TIP students spoke more standard English and less pidgin-like English. Instead of, "He cheat my line," we heard, "He budged." Instead of, "I drink water?" we heard, "Can I go get a drink?" Such examples were numerous, and we documented them throughout the year. More exposure to positive role models also seemed to lead to TIP students exhibiting fewer behavior problems. We theorized that TIP students were less likely to misbehave because of exposure to mainstream role models who understood what was expected of them in school.

Our system of providing first language instruction was also a great advantage to TIP students. They seemed to be willing to take more risks and engage more readily when they knew they could use their first language if needed. While one might think that frequent instruction in Hmong would hinder the development of English skills, we found the opposite to be true. We observed that TIP students were better able to participate in class discussions, and their reading and math skills also improved more rapidly, than their counterparts in the earlier self-contained model. We attributed the improvement, in part, to first language instruction. Indeed, research has shown that, if students gain academic skills in their first language, they will be able to transfer them to a second language (Collier, 1989, 1992; Cummins, 1984).

Benefits for Non-TIP Students

While much of our focus in planning and evaluating TIP was on how to provide better

services to those students in the program, it should be noted that our mainstream students also benefited from TIP. First, our class sizes at first grade were smaller than they had ever been previously. By using the former self-contained program room as an additional mainstream first grade, we spread our first grade students out and reduced class sizes. Second, in math classes, where the classroom teacher, ESL teacher and bilingual E.A. team-taught, the whole class often heard parts of lessons in Hmong. Non-Hmong speakers actually came to understand the language to some extent, and often participated even during Hmong instruction. All students gained appreciation and respect for the Hmong language as a valid vehicle for academic discussion and learning.

FORMAL EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM

In addition to the informal observation of students, we used several formal tools to evaluate the efficacy of the program. First we compared placement of the TIP students after one year to placements of students from previous self-contained ("TESOL") classes from Frost Lake. Next we used data gathered by the district on student academic performance in the areas of reading fluency and math computation and compared TIP student growth to that of a class of comparable students from a self-contained ("TESOL") classroom at another school. Finally, we surveyed classroom teachers and specialists who worked with TIP students about changes they observed and summarized their responses.

Exiting/Placement Data

As stated previously, students may remain in St. Paul's self-contained language development program ("TESOL") for up to two years. However, our goal in TIP was to exit as many students as possible after one year. At the end of first grade, our TIP teacher, like all TESOL teachers in St. Paul, determined students' readiness for exiting using the district criteria:

Language Acquisition

- Retell story with picture stimuli
- Follow three-part directions
- Respond to yes/no questions
- Share personal experiences orally

Reading

- Read at mid-first grade level (according to district standards)

Math
- Perform at mid-first grade level (according to district standards)

Writing
- Write three sentences about a picture (accurate grammar, syntax and spelling not required)

Exiting results from the first year appear promising. In the mid-1990's, Frost Lake exited only 0-8% of students from the self-contained class into their correct grades. In the first year of TIP, 29% of students were placed in the age-appropriate grade after receiving one year of TIP services. After the second year of TIP, we project that 40% of students will exit into their correct grade levels.

Student Academic Performance

The St. Paul school district decided that it would administer several tests to the TIP students and compare their results to a comparable class which operated under the old self-contained TESOL model. In both cases all participating students in the testing were Hmong, and all had qualified for the language development ("TESOL") program based on the district's Kindergarten TESOL Academic Test. Teachers of both classes were deemed to be strong teachers by administrators in the district.

A statistical analysis (t-test) of the Kindergarten TESOL Academic Test scores, administered in November of the academic year, showed that there was no significant difference between the two classes in the fall. Similarly, a t-test done on reading fluency (number of words read correctly in one minute on three increasingly difficult passages) and a timed math computation test (addition and subtraction problems) administered in November showed that there was no significant difference between the two groups in the fall.

Retesting of identical reading and math measures in May showed that the experimental group, the Frost Lake TIP class, made greater gains than the traditional self-contained TESOL class. A summary of the data can be found in the following tables:

Kindergarten TESOL Academic Test

Fall Frost Lake TIP Average Score n=13	Fall Comparison Class Average Score n=10
147.8 (out of 200)	138.5 (out of 200)

Kindergarten fall tests are not significantly different. (p-value .24, p>.20).

Reading Fluency Test

Fall Frost Lake TIP Average n=13	Spring Frost Lake TIP Average n=13	Fall Comparison Class Average n=10	Spring Comparison Class Average n=10
20.6	113.1	26.8	63

Fall results are not significantly different (p-value .84, p>.80).
Spring results are significant at the .02 level (p-value .016, p<.02).

Timed Math Computation Test

Fall Frost Lake TIP Average n=13	Spring Frost Lake TIP Average n=13	Fall Comparison Class Average n=10	Spring Comparison Class Average n=10
1.4	11.8	.9	5.9

Fall results for are not significantly different (p-value .36, p>.10).
Spring results are significant at the .10 level (p-value .06, p<.10).

These academic test results suggest that the new TIP model appears to be more effective in promoting students academic performance in reading fluency and math computation than the traditional self-contained TESOL model.

Staff Survey

Like the comparison of placement data, our survey of staff who worked with TIP students also showed the new program to be a success. The survey was completed by classroom teachers and the physical education, music, art and science specialists.

(See Appendix B for survey questions.) In previous years, specialists' classes had been two thirds mainstream and one third from the self-contained ("TESOL") class. In the new program, their classes had three TIP students each. When asked how TIP students had been successful and what they had gained, teachers said that the TIP students in their classes participated more than their counterparts from the self-contained program had. One first grade teacher wrote, "They have all been successful in keeping up with the class..." From another: "Their language grew by leaps and bounds and they were an essential part of the life of our class..." Several of the teachers observed that TIP students had more English-speaking friends, and thus more English-speaking role models. In summary, "Their oral skills are great. They don't feel like outcasts. They have a classroom of peers where they fit in and have English-speaking role models....The children have all benefited both academically and socially from this model."

In the surveys, teachers also indicated that they had adapted their instruction to meet the needs of TIP students. Teachers employed the use of many common techniques for making language comprehensible. (See Krashen, 1982, for a list of such techniques.) "My instruction is much more specific and contains more hands-on examples." "I talk more slowly..." "I try to use physical examples as I talk." "I do more cooperative groups,...and they have learned a lot from each other." The adaptations the teachers describe are widely acknowledged characteristics of good teaching in general, and certainly benefited all of the children in the class. One teacher wrote, "The changes have been good for all my students, since many of my kids are Hmong...." Another said, "I think it benefits all students." As mentioned above, changes in instruction helped socially as well as academically: "Those who are not Hmong have learned to feel empathy and understanding."

When asked about the overall success of the TIP model at Frost Lake, teachers' responses were extremely positive:

> I feel the partnership with parents, students, ESL teacher, E.A. and me has been good for <u>all</u> the students.
>
> Yes!...They have succeeded in learning the skills I needed to teach them

and I think they feel good about themselves.

I feel we have given these students the environment and academic support to build self-confident and successful life-long learners. They are no longer isolated and made to feel different. They are given the one-on-one or small group support they need without being grouped in multi-aged, non-English speaking classrooms with little or no support.

ISSUES AND CHALLENGES

In the planning and implementation of TIP at Frost Lake, we encountered many issues and challenges that we needed to address. All staff involved had to change the way they viewed students and the way they delivered instruction. In addition, there were several logistical challenges which we had to face.

Ownership of Students

Teachers in the new program had to become accustomed to a new understanding of the "ownership" of students. In the past, because students spent most of the day in one classroom, teachers knew their students very well. Students were usually only pulled out for short times, and classroom teachers usually believed they had to make up what students had missed. Overall, teachers felt responsible for students' progress in all subject areas. They had a clear sense of "my students" versus "your students" and were uncomfortable with the notion of sharing.

In our new model, teachers had to undergo a significant shift in their view of responsibility for student progress. Instead of teachers being accountable for students' progress in all areas, teachers had to learn to trust their colleagues and share that responsibility. For example, TIP students were taught most reading and all math outside of the classroom, so the classroom teacher was not always aware of students' particular needs and challenges. However, by consistently sharing information with each other, and gradually working on letting go, the team of teachers was able to achieve a feeling of shared ownership of students.

Teaming and Collaboration

With shared ownership of students comes the need for significant collaboration

between teachers. We found that we needed not only to plan team-teaching lessons together, but also to discuss specific problems students were having, behavioral incidents, progress that had been made, themes and skills being taught in the classrooms, scheduling of tutoring time with the E.A., and many other issues. In addition, twice during the year, we needed to meet together more formally to assess students' progress and complete report cards. Finding time for such working together was a significant challenge, but one which we managed quite successfully.

In order to plan collaborative lessons, the ESL teacher and classroom teachers usually met after school. In order to plan most efficiently, we defined our roles specifically. For example, when teaching math, the classroom teacher was responsible for steering the math curriculum, and the ESL teacher was responsible for adapting that curriculum to meet the needs of the ESL students. Most of our teachers' communication not related to lesson planning occurred in passing, in memos, or through the E.A. For reviewing student progress and completing report cards, we were fortunate to have substitutes provided for one day. With such extensive collaboration, it was essential to have that time away from the classroom to work together. Overall, we found that teachers involved in the TIP program benefited from working closely together. We learned to be more flexible, and, through teaming, improved our teaching skills.

Qualifications of Teachers

Another obstacle we encountered in the process of implementing TIP at Frost Lake was the perception held by mainstream teachers that ESL teachers are not qualified to be students' primary reading teachers, and that classroom teachers are not qualified to teach novice English speakers. While it is true that some ESL teacher education programs do not focus as heavily on reading as others, we found at Frost Lake that our ESL teacher certainly had the experience and the skills to implement the TIP model. During the year, she participated in further training offered by the school, the district, and by one publisher in order to enhance her competence in teaching reading. In addition, in order to ensure consistency across the first grade in reading, the ESL teacher, like all teachers in the Frost Lake reading program, used the adopted reading series as the primary material for reading instruction and followed district and state

standards to guide the TIP reading curriculum. Overall, we found the ESL teacher's understanding of the students' needs, and increased expertise, to be an asset to our students. As the year progressed, the perception of ESL teachers as not qualified to teach reading diminished and, again, our confidence in a system of shared ownership of students increased.

In addition to the ESL teacher's qualifications, we also had to address the perception among ESL teachers that classroom teachers were not qualified to teach novice English speakers. Actually, we found that our classroom teachers rose to the challenge. They already had significant experience working with second language learners because of Frost Lake's high percentage of ESL students. Also, they were committed to making TIP work, and thus worked to improve their knowledge of teaching second language learners. They were consistently aware of the need to adapt their instruction to meet TIP students' needs. The ESL teacher was often used as a resource for teaching suggestions or modeling methods. Finally, our first grade teachers attended district workshops and building-sponsored training sessions. Without the commitment of all teachers involved to improving and enhancing their skills, the issue of qualifications would have been much more difficult.

Costs of the TIP Model

The implementation of TIP was somewhat more expensive than the self-contained classroom was. To staff the program, we needed an additional first grade teacher (we increased the number of first grade classes from three to four) and a full-time educational assistant (we previously had one quarter-time). Since we would serve fewer students in the new model than the self-contained class had, the lower student-teacher ratio also increased the cost. Finally, we needed substitutes for days when the ESL teacher and classroom teacher were provided planning time for report cards.

In the negotiations for the new model, we devised a plan for sharing costs between the district and the building. The district agreed to pay staffing costs, and Frost Lake's building budget covered substitute coverage for TIP teachers. Such cost-sharing was widely supported because everyone involved benefited from the new model.

Space

Like most elementary schools in St. Paul, Frost Lake is already over-crowded, and seems to become more so each year. With the addition of numerous support teachers in Title I, ESL, and special education, the need for small, pull-out classroom spaces has increased dramatically. Unfortunately, the implementation of TIP only added to an already difficult space situation. However, in planning the model, we felt it was crucial that TIP students still have a space outside of the classroom where sheltered instruction could occur. The main advantage of the self-contained classroom in the old program was that students could feel comfortable taking risks in English, and we wanted to be certain that a similarly supportive environment was available in TIP. Our principal, who supported the development of the program in many areas, guaranteed that TIP would have a space outside of the classrooms. While the TIP space was small, it provided the safety that students needed to take risks and participate more willingly in class.

Prior to TIP, the self-contained ("TESOL") program had been supplied with most of the materials found in a mainstream classroom. The program had math manipulatives and textbooks, reading materials, all texts from the district ESL curriculum adoption, and many other miscellaneous materials. With the implementation of the new program, and the move by the ESL teacher into a much smaller space, the materials of the old program could no longer be stored in one central location. Furthermore, the ESL teacher was no longer teaching all subjects and therefore did not need all the materials. Our solution to the storage problem turned out to be beneficial to all. We used many of the former TESOL materials to outfit the new first grade classroom. The ESL teacher kept what she needed to teach reading and language in her small space, and other materials were shared with kindergarten and first grade teachers as needed. Much in the way we had adapted to a new shared ownership of students, we also became accustomed to sharing materials.

CONCLUSION

Throughout the entire process of planning TIP, we encountered the issues above and many others. Numerous times we thought that the district bureaucracy would prevent us from implementing the program. However, eventually we reached agreement and

were able to proceed. In retrospect, it has become evident that there were four key factors in our success at implementing the new model. First, all of the staff involved were invested in the success of the model. As mentioned above, instead of simply moving the "burden" of teaching the novice students from one teacher to another, we were intent upon making the new model beneficial to everyone, students and teachers. Second, we took over one year to plan the model and work out all details prior to the students' first day. In fact, we could have started one year earlier, but we decided to delay implementation until we could have time to anticipate all problems and fully discuss all aspects of the new model. Third, we had the benefit of a strong, committed principal on our team. She repeatedly acted as an advocate for our building, our teachers, and, most importantly, our TIP students. She took risks and negotiated compromises which, in the end, were critical to the success of the program. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, each member of our team was committed, flexible, and willing to change the way things had always been done because of the common goal of providing the best education possible to all students.

After one year of TIP, at the time of this writing, the program looks very promising. We were able to provide first language support and extra attention in an environment that maximized interaction with the mainstream. As a result, it appears we were able to enhance students' academic achievement. Now in its second year, the program has expanded and is serving both first and second graders. The district is now promoting this model, among others, in a major initiative to reform the way ESL services are delivered for beginning English language learners. It is our hope that the changes will lead to a better education for the increasing number of ESL students in St. Paul and throughout the area.

REFERENCES

Auerbach, E.R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 27,* 9-32.

Baker, C. (1997). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 2nd Edition.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Collier, V. P. (1989). How long? A synthesis of research on academic achievement in a second language. *TESOL Quarterly 23 (3),* 509-531.

Collier, V. P. (1992). A synthesis of studies examining long-term language minority student data on academic achievement. *Bilingual Research Journal 16 (1&2),* 187-212.

Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework* (pp. 3-49). Los Angelos, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center.

Cummins, J. (1984). *Bilingualism and Special Education: Issues in Assessment and Pedagogy,* San Diego, CA: College-Hill, 136-151.

Edstam, T. (1998). *Perceptions of professionalism among elementary school English as a second language teachers.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Hakuta, K. (1986). *The Mirror of Language: The Debate on Bilingualism.* New York: Basic Books.

Krashen, S.D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition.* New York: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S.D. (1993). Bilingual Education Works. In Oller, J.W. (Ed.), *Methods That Work: Ideas for Literacy and Language Teachers* (pp. 89-98). Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Krashen, S.D. (1996). *Under Attack: The Case Against Bilingual Education. Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.*

Long, M. H. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. Gass and

C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 77-99). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Lucas, T. & Katz, A. (1994). Reframing the debate: The roles of native languages in English-only programs for language minority students. *TESOL Quarterly 28,* 537-561.

Mabbott, A. & Strohl, J. (1992). Pull-in programs - A new trend in ESL education?. *MinneTESOL Journal 10,* 21-30.

Peregoy, S. & Boyle, O. (1997). *Reading, Writing, & Learning in ESL.* New York: Longman.

Woodcock, R. W. & Muñoz-Sandoval, A. F. (1993). *Woodcock-Muñoz Language Survey - English Form.* Chicago: Riverside.

APPENDIX A

Daily Schedule - ESL Teacher

8:00 - 8:15	Prep
8:15 - 9:00	Math A* - in room 107
9:10 - 9:45	Language Arts/ESL B* - in TESOL room (134)
9:45 - 10:45	**Reading B** - in TESOL room (134)
10:45 - 11:45	**Reading A** - in TESOL room (134)
11:45 - 12:15	Lunch
12:15 - 12:30	Meet with Educational Assistant
12:30 - 1:15	Math B* - in room 111
1:15 - 1:50	Language Arts/ESL A* - in TESOL room (134)
1:50 - 2:20	Prep

NOTE: Classrooms serving TIP students were clustered into two groups, "A" and "B." "A" classrooms received services at "A" times, and "B" classrooms received services at "B" times.
Times in bold taught by ESL teacher and E.A. outside of the homeroom.
*Indicates ESL Teacher and E.A. team-teaching in homeroom with mainstream teacher

Daily Schedule - Educational Assistant

7:45 - 8:05	Hall - help TIP students with notes, bus, etc.
8:05 - 8:15	Phone calls/Meet with ESL Teacher
8:15 - 9:00	Math A*
9:00 - 9:45	Alternating every two weeks: - TIP ESL/Language Class - Science class+
9:45 - 10:45	**Reading B**
10:45 - 11:45	**Reading A**
11:45 - 12:15	Lunch
12:15 - 12:30	Meet with ESL Teacher
12:30 - 1:15	Math B*
1:15 - 1:50	Alternating daily: - Help in classrooms - Read individually with students
1:50 - 2:10	Individual tutoring
2:10 - 2:30	Hall Duty/Available to be in classes to explain important parent correspondence
2:30 - 3:15	Phone calls/Meet with ESL Teacher

NOTE: Classrooms serving TIP students were clustered into two groups, "A" and "B." "A" classrooms received services at "A" times, and "B" classrooms received services at "B" times.
Times in bold taught by ESL Teacher and E.A. outside of the homeroom.
* Indicates team-teaching with ESL teacher and mainstream teacher in the homeroom.
+Indicates E.A. providing first language support in mainstream class

APPENDIX B

Frost Lake TESOL Inclusion Program (TIP) Teacher Survey

1. How many TIP students are in your class?_____
How many students are in your class in total?_____

2. How have TIP students been successful in your class? In other words, what are they able to do well, along with the rest of the class? Please give specific examples.

3. What has been most difficult for TIP students in your class? Please give specific examples.

4. What do you feel that TIP students have gained from being in the mainstream, that they would not gain in a self-contained TESOL class? Please give specific examples.

5. Do you notice significant discrepancies between mainstream students and TIP students in your class? In what areas?

6. How have you changed your instruction in order to meet the needs of your TIP students?

7. How have the above changes in your instruction affected the other students in your class?

8. Has the support - both academic and home/school liaison - provided by the TIP program been sufficient to help TIP students succeed? In what ways? What could have been improved?

9. In general, do you believe that TIP at Frost Lake has been successful? Why and how?

FL 026 957

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC®

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: An Alternative Model for Novice-Level Elementary ESL Education

Author(s): Karen Duke, Ann Mabbott

Corporate Source: TESOL 2001 Conference

Publication Date: Minne WiTESOL Journal 2000

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 1 ↑ ☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A ↑ ☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B ↑ ☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Karen Duke	Printed Name/Position/Title: Karen Duke / Teacher
Organization/Address: 1459 Simpson St. St. Paul, MN 55108	Telephone: 651-649-1580 FAX:
	E-Mail Address: duke0002@umn.edu Date: 10-10-01

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor: MinneTESOL/WITESOL Journal
Address: P.O. Box 141072 Minneapolis, MN 55414
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on
Languages & Linguistics
4646 40TH ST. NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20016-1859

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com